



Indiana Professional Standards Board

Joseph E. Kernan, Governor
Marie Theobald, Ed.D. Executive Director

101 W. Ohio Street-Suite 300
Indianapolis, IN 46204-1953
Telephone: (317) 232-9010
Toll free: (866) 542-3672
Fax: (317) 232-9023
www.in.gov/psb

Reading Advisory Committee Edit Team

Action Report: Standards Revisions Resulting From Public Comment

October 9, 2003

*If Indiana students are to achieve high standards, there must be
competent, caring, and qualified educators to get them there.*

Introduction

On March 10th, 2003, stakeholders across the state of Indiana received an electronic copy of the newly developed standards for the teacher of reading, a survey, and a memorandum requesting feedback by April 25th, 2003. The total responses received via fax, post and electronic mail totaled thirty-nine (39). The thirty-nine (39) constituents represented the following: classroom teachers all levels, twenty-one (21); building level administrators, two (2); district level administrators, three (3); higher education, eleven (11); unknown, two (2).

The reading edit team met together on July 1st, 2003, to discuss responses to the survey and to determine the necessity for any revisions to the draft standards document. While the edit committee interpreted a general consensus among stakeholders that the standards were strong as written, some revisions resulted from public comment. Below is a list of the survey questions along with a summary of responses according to the Likert Scale. Please note: Although a total of thirty-nine (39) surveys were received, not all respondents answered each question. This is reflected under the column labeled "Total Responses."

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u> (5)	<u>Agree</u> (4)	<u>Undecided</u> (3)	<u>Disagree</u> (2)	<u>Strongly Disagree</u> (1)	<u>Total Responses</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Variance</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
#1	The standards are written in a clear, understandable manner.								
	17	18	1	0	2	38	4.263		
#2	The standards are sensitive to ethnic & cultural diversity.								
	21	11	2	1	1	36	4.389		
#3	The standards are gender neutral.								
	29	7	0	0	2	38	4.605		
#4	The standards reflect the current knowledge base (i.e., "best practices") available to educators.								
	17	14	3	0	2	36	4.222		
#5	There are important related ideas that are NOT covered by these standards.								
	3	4	11	11	7	36	2.583		
#6	Some of the standards are redundant.								
	3	15	7	10	2	37	3.189		
#7	The issues addressed in the standards cover the critical concerns of my constituents.								
	9	18	6	0	2	35	3.914		
#8	The performance statements correlate clearly with the knowledge and disposition statements.								
	7	25	2	1	1	36	4.000		
#9	The performances that are described are assessable.								
	4	25	5	3	1	38	3.711		
#10	The standards are realistic.								
	6	23	7	1	2	39	3.769		

Summary of Revisions

Questions with Lowest Mean Scores:

Question #5 – There are important related ideas that are NOT covered by these standards.

This was one of two questions stated in the negative; therefore the low mean score of 2.583 can be interpreted as positive. There were no comments submitted for review in regards to this particular survey question.

Question #6 – Some of the standards are redundant.

This is another question for which a low mean score indicates overall positive response; however, fifteen (15) respondents agreed with the statement while three (3) respondents strongly agreed. As with former standards development committees, the Reading Edit Committee determined the redundancy stems primarily from seeing the words “knowledge,” “disposition,” and “performances” repeated under each standard. The edit committee concluded that any other existing redundancy is necessary to creating meaningful linkages between the standards and, therefore, not cause for major revision. There were no specific comments from respondents included for further consideration.

Edit Committee Response to Proposed Revisions:

Standard 2, Knowledge 1 –

- (1) “Change ‘habits of mind’ to ‘metacognition.’” The Edit Committee determined that the term “habits of mind” includes but is not limited to “metacognition,” and that the document should remain as jargon free as possible. No change.
- (2) “Add the word ‘average’ before the word ‘student.’” The Edit Committee determined that the teacher should understand how all students learn and develop reading strategies. No change.

Standard 2, Knowledge 4 –

The Edit Committee determined the statement unnecessarily redundant and deleted it.

Standard 4, Knowledge 7 –

Added the term “libraries” in response to the concern that libraries had not been mentioned in the document. Although the term “media centers” was intended to include libraries, the committee determined the change to be merited and also included a new statement: “Utilizes professional journals, libraries, media centers and information technology to find relevant education research that informs instruction,” as Standard 4, Performance 7.

Standard 4, Performance 5 –

The original performance did not appear to fit the standard. A new performance statement was created to address the comment: “add performances that include more about the reciprocal relationship between reading and writing.”

Additional Comments and Edit Committee Response:

- (1) ***List the tools of inquiry.*** The committee did not wish to list items that might prove limiting thereby relying on university programs to provide training in the appropriate tools of inquiry.
- (2) ***Where is the term “balanced instruction?”*** As with the word, “metacognition,” the committee decided to avoid jargon when able to use other ways to describe certain approaches and/or methodologies. In Standard 7, Knowledge 9, the standards address a cross-curricular approach, and in Standard 9, Performance 5, reference is made to the use of “professional literature as a tool to improve student performance.”
- (3) ***Emphasize the distinction between Reading as a content area, Language Arts as a separate content area as well as distinguish between reading and other literacy activities.*** The committee determined that the emphasis on reading is inherent as the standards are for the teacher of Reading. In addition, the committee remains convinced that the content areas of Reading and Language Arts are so integrated that they did not see reason to completely isolate one from the other. During the standards development process, the committee worked to align the Indiana Standards for the Teacher of Reading with the Department of Education student standards. To more clearly identify that alignment, members of the Edit Committee chose to amend Standard 7, Knowledge 8 to read, “knows the Indiana academic standards for English/Language Arts, specifically those which apply to Reading.” Finally, the Edit Committee kept the use of the term “literacy” to be used interchangeably with regard to reading activities. This decision was based on the fact that the International Reading Association uses the term “literacy” in their standards.
- (4) ***Teachers should possess specific knowledge about assessment, diagnosis and evaluation.*** The committee believes that having a specific rather than a general knowledge of assessment, diagnosis and evaluation is more appropriate for the Reading Specialist. For the reading teacher, the continuous cycle of diagnosis, assessment and evaluation for all students is addressed in Standard 1, Knowledge 10, Disposition 2, and Performance 3 as well as in Standard 2, Performance 1.

During both the standards development and edit process, the Reading Advisory Committee referred to various resources provided by the following organizations: Indiana Professional Standards Board, Indiana Department of Education, National Board for Professional Standards, International Reading Association and INTASC.

Conclusion

Based on the survey responses collected, the Reading Edit Committee concluded that there is a high level of acceptance of the standards for the Teacher of Reading as written. Furthermore, the Edit Committee strongly believes that the revisions as proposed in this summary document and in the attached draft standards serve to improve the likelihood of acceptance among stakeholders. The Reading Edit Committee recommends that the Standards Committee accept the draft standards with proposed revisions.